

1978 Ron Guidry, New York Yankees
 1977 Sparky Lyle, New York Yankees
 1976 Jim Palmer, Baltimore Orioles
 1975 Jim Palmer, Baltimore Orioles
 1974 Jim (Catfish) Hunter, Oakland Athletics
 1973 Jim Palmer, Baltimore Orioles
 1972 Gaylord Perry, Cleveland Indians
 1971 Vida Blue, Oakland Athletics
 1970 Jim Perry, Minnesota Twins
 1969 (tie) Mike Cuellar, Baltimore Orioles;
 Denny McLain, Detroit Tigers
 1968 Denny McLain, Detroit Tigers
 1967 Jim Lonborg, Boston Red Sox
 1964 Dean Chance, Los Angeles Angels
 1961 Whitey Ford, New York Yankees
 1959 Early Wynn, Chicago White Sox
 1958 Bob Turley, New York Yankees

Note: One award from 1956-66; NL pitchers won in 1956-57, 1960, 1962-63, 1965-66.

THE VERY BAD DEBT BOXSCORE

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, at the close of business yesterday, Tuesday, November 16, 1999, the Federal debt stood at \$5,689,775,697,887.62 (Five trillion, six hundred eighty-nine billion, seven hundred seventy-five million, six hundred ninety-seven thousand, eight hundred eighty-seven dollars and sixty-two cents).

One year ago, November 16, 1998, the Federal debt stood at \$5,581,706,000,000 (Five trillion, five hundred eighty-one billion, seven hundred six million).

Five years ago, November 16, 1994, the Federal debt stood at \$4,748,423,000,000 (Four trillion, seven hundred forty-eight billion, four hundred twenty-three million).

Ten years ago, November 16, 1989, the Federal debt stood at \$2,918,690,000,000 (Two trillion, nine hundred eighteen billion, six hundred ninety million).

Fifteen years ago, November 16, 1984, the Federal debt stood at \$1,627,271,000,000 (One trillion, six hundred twenty-seven billion, two hundred seventy-one million) which reflects a debt increase of more than \$4 trillion—\$4,062,504,697,887.62 (Four trillion, sixty-two billion, five hundred four million, six hundred ninety-seven thousand, eight hundred eighty-seven dollars and sixty-two cents) during the past 15 years.

UNDER THE INFLUENCE

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, in July, when the Senate debated the Commerce, Justice, State, and Judiciary fiscal year 2000 spending bill, an important amendment was adopted to the bill. That amendment, offered by my colleague Senator BOXER, would have made it illegal to sell or transfer firearms or ammunition to anyone under the influence of alcohol. Unfortunately, the House-Senate conference committee, in working out the differences between the two versions of this spending measure, removed the Senate-passed amendment from the final bill.

I do not understand how something so simple, so straightforward, could be deleted from the final bill. This amendment does nothing more than save

lives and prevent injuries by prohibiting drunks from buying guns or ammunition. Under current law, it is illegal to sell firearms or ammunition to a purchaser under the influence of illicit drugs. This would simply close the loophole by making it illegal for someone under the influence of alcohol to purchase the same products.

It is unconscionable that House and Senate conferees deleted this commonsense provision from the bill. Unfortunately, this is just another example of how reasonable legislation is repeatedly stymied by the power of the NRA.

THE MICROSOFT RULING

Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, two core principles guide our economy, competition and the rule of law. In the absence of competition there is no innovation or consumer choice. For over 100 years the anti-trust laws have served as an indispensable bulwark to ensure that unfettered competition does not result in monopoly power that stifles innovation and denies consumers a choice.

So it is curious that a veritable who's who of "conservative" politicians and think tanks unleashed a barrage of faxes attacking Federal Judge Thomas Penfield Jackson's decision in *United States v. Microsoft*.

Based on a voluminous record, Judge Jackson found that Microsoft had succeeded in "stifling innovations that would benefit consumers, for the sole reason that they do not coincide with Microsoft's self-interest."

The factual findings of the District Court held that "Microsoft will use its prodigious market power and immense profits to harm any firm that insists on pursuing initiatives that could intensify competition against one of its core products."

According to the District Court, Microsoft "foreclosed an opportunity for PC makers to make Windows PC systems less confusing and more user-friendly as consumers desired."

The record included the testimony of numerous high tech entrepreneurs who felt the lash of Microsoft's monopolistic wrath. From IBM's inability to gain support for its OS2/Warp operating system to Apple's inability to effectively compete with Windows to threats to cut off Netscape's "oxygen supply," Microsoft engaged in a pernicious pattern of anticompetitive behavior, openly flaunting the rule of law. Perhaps the most damning of all was the evasive testimony of Microsoft founder William Gates.

It is, frankly, a record that is quite embarrassing. But rather than show remorse, Microsoft has embarked on a vendetta to punish the outstanding group of Justice Department lawyers who bested its minions of high-paid lawyers and spin doctors.

So, Mr. President, let me take this opportunity to praise the Justice Department's Antitrust Division and its leader Joel Klein. It is well known that

I had my doubts about Mr. Klein, but I am pleased to say, and not too proud to admit, that I misjudged him. He is doing an outstanding job.

In the long run, failure to promote competition and innovation will undermine our preeminence in the high tech arena.

THE CONSERVATION AND REINVESTMENT ACT OF 1999

Mrs. LINCOLN. Mr. President, I rise today to join the Senator from Louisiana in calling upon our colleagues in the Senate, as well as the Administration, to capitalize on the momentum provided by the House Resources Committee last week in passing the Conservation and Reinvestment Act of 1999. We must not let this opportunity slip away to enact what may well be the most significant conservation effort of the century.

As part of any discussion into utilizing revenues from Outer Continental Shelf oil drilling to fund conservation programs, I want to ensure that wildlife programs are kept among the priorities of the debate. Specifically, I want to comment upon the importance of funding for wildlife conservation, education, and restoration efforts as provided in both the House and Senate versions of the Conservation and Reinvestment Act of 1999. This funding would be administered as a permanent funding source through the successful Pittman-Robertson Act.

This program enjoys a great deal of support including a coalition of nearly 3,000 groups across the country known as the Teeming with Wildlife Coalition. Also, this funding would be provided without imposing new taxes. Funds will be allocated to all 50 states for wildlife conservation of non-game species, with the principal goal of preventing species from becoming endangered or listed under the Endangered Species Act.

In my home state of Arkansas, we have recognized the importance of funding conservation and management initiatives. The people of Arkansas were successful in passing a one-eighth cent sales tax to fund these types of programs. As I'm sure is true all across this country, people don't mind paying taxes for programs that promote good wildlife management and help keep species off of the Endangered Species List.

By taking steps now to prevent species from becoming endangered, we are not only able to conserve the significant cultural heritage of wildlife enjoyment for the people of this country, but also to avoid the substantial costs associated with recovery for endangered species. In fact, all 50 states would benefit as a result of the important link between these wildlife education-based initiatives and the benefits of wildlife-related tourism.

I look forward to working with my colleagues on the Senate Energy and Natural Resources Committee to make